

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

CLOSED

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

---

CHARLES IBN MUHAMMAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEWARK HOUSING AUTHORITY,  
KEITH KINARD, JANET ABRAHAM,  
WINIFRED THOMPSON, VERIZON,  
POSTMASTER GENERAL, JOHN DOE,

Defendants.

---

**Hon. Dennis M. Cavanaugh**

**ORDER**

Civil Action No. 11-CV-3441 (DMC - MF)

---

CHARLES MUHAMMAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

VERIZON, VERIZON  
CORPORATION'S TECHNICAL,  
LEGAL, MANAGERIAL, FINANCIAL,  
ETC.,

Defendants.

---

Civil Action No. 12-CV-3090 (DMC - MF)

---

CHARLES MUHAMMAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEWARK HOUSING AUTHORITY,  
KEITH KINARD, HOUSING  
AUTHORITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES,  
LEGAL ADVISORS, MANAGERS,  
SECURITY, MAINTENANCE,

Defendants.

---

Civil Action No. 12-CV-3092 (DMC - MF)

This matter comes before the Court upon several of Plaintiff's filings in the four above captioned matters. After considering the filings and based upon the following;

**WHEREAS** Plaintiff's four complaints relate to an incident or multiple incidents occurring during a period of residence in Newark Public Housing, and reference a contract claim styled in a similarly arcane manner against Defendant Verizon;

**WHEREAS** “motions to proceed [*in forma pauperis*] must be assessed in a two-step process. ‘First, the district court evaluates a litigant’s financial status and determines whether (s)he is eligible to proceed *in forma pauperis* under § 1915(a). Second, the court assesses the

complaint under [§ 1915(e)(2)] to determine whether it is frivolous,” Shneller v. Able Home Care, Inc., 389 F. App’x 90, 92 (3d Cir. 2010) (citing Roman v. Jeffes, 904 F.2d 192, 194 n.1 (3d Cir. 1990) (citation omitted));

**WHEREAS** this Court previously found that given proof of Plaintiff’s financial status, he is eligible to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Docket No. 11-cv-3441, ECF No. 9);

**WHEREAS** 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) states that the dismissal of an *in forma pauperis* proceeding is appropriate at any time upon this Court’s finding that the complaint is frivolous or malicious or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted;

**WHEREAS** Plaintiff’s contentions in each complaint, common in law and fact, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, and as such, the remaining complaints in the consolidated action are dismissed;

**WHEREAS** this Court previously handled a motion for reconsideration (Docket No. 11-cv-3441, ECF No. 5) where Plaintiff made arguments in a similar vein to the one presently before the Court, filed in Docket No. 12-cv-3092 (ECF No. 3) this Court hereby adopts the same conclusion, denying the motion for reconsideration;

**WHEREAS** Plaintiff has filed multiple letters, motions for reconsideration and complaints based upon the same incident in these four actions;

**IT IS HEREBY**, on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2012, for the reasons expressed herein;

**ORDERED** that the four matters are consolidated into the earliest filed action at Docket No. 11-cv-3441;

**ORDERED** that applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* are **granted**;

**ORDERED** that the motion for reconsideration filed August 13, 2012 (Docket No. 12-

cv-3092, ECF No. 3) is **denied**; and,

**ORDERED** that the complaints are **dismissed with prejudice** against all Defendants and the consolidated case **closed**,

**ORDERED** that the Clerk's office **not file** any further submissions of Charles (Ibn) Muhammad pertaining to the closed consolidated action, but rather transmit the same to Chambers for review and instruction from the Court as to whether such submissions will be filed, maintained in Chambers, or returned to Muhammad.

s/ Dennis M. Cavanaugh  
Dennis M. Cavanaugh, U.S.D.J.

Orig.: Clerk  
cc: All Counsel of Record  
File